APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/058,496	04/10/98	MICHAUD J	07844/273001

LM02/1216

ROGER S BOROVOY
FISH & RICHARDSON
SUITE 100
2200 SAND HILL ROAD
MENLO PARK CA 94025

EXAMINER
BASHORE, W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2777	7

DATE MAILED:
12/16/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _Jul 19, 1999_

☐ This action is **FINAL.**

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle* 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire _____3_____ month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) _1-27_ is/are pending in the applicat

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) _1-27_ is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____ .

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____6_____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

DETAILED ACTION

1.   **Examiner's Note** - With regard to applicant's Information Disclosure Statement filed

July 19, 1999, the Macromedia reference is not considered due to a missing copyright page.

Please include page showing publisher and copyright information with next correspondence.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all**

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

3.   **Claims 1-11, 13-20, 22-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable**

over Mapedit Imagemap Editing Software (hereinafter Mapedit), Version 2.3 for Windows

3.1, 1997 by Boutell.Com, Inc. URL: http://www.boutell.com/mapedit, in view of

CompuWorks Labels (hereinafter CompuWorks), Version 4.0.000, 1995 by John P.

Osborn.

       In regard to independent claim 1, Mapedit discloses a method whereby areas of a

graphic file are portioned, with a specific URL assigned to each portion so as to activate a URL

when an area is selected (see Mapedit Figures 4, 5, 10; compare with claim 1 lines 4-7,

"calculating a definition of an area corresponding....when the area is selected."). Mapedit does

not disclose a method of creating a graphics file, nor does Mapedit disclose methods for

identifying layers and non-transparent regions of said graphics file. However, CompuWorks

discloses a method of layered shape creation whereby shapes can be rendered as transparent or

non-transparent, so as to make identification of said shapes possible (see CompuWorks Figure 2,

3; compare with claim 1 lines 3-4, *"for a selected layer of the artwork, identifying a non-*

transparent region of the layer"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention to apply the methods of CompuWorks to the method of Mapedit,

because of CompuWorks's taught advantage of graphical editing, providing increased

functionality to the imagemap method as taught by Mapedit.

In regard to dependent claim 2, Mapedit discloses a method of assigning a URL to a

selected region (see Mapedit Figure 5; compare with claim 2).

In regard to dependent claim 3, Mapedit discloses a method whereby a graphics file

associated with an HTML file is displayed onto a screen (see Mapedit Figures 2, 3). Mapedit

does not disclose a method of creating and recognizing composite images. However,

CompuWorks discloses a method whereby a label is created consisting of layered graphical

shapes and text which are composited for a single label (ie. index card) (see CompuWorks

Figure 2; compare with claim 3 line 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention to apply the method of CompuWorks to the method of Mapedit,

because of CompuWorks's taught advantage of image conglomeration, providing increased

creativity to the imagemap method as taught by Mapedit.

In addition, Mapedit discloses a method of converting a hotspot area along with

associated URLs to an HTML file format (see Mapedit Figure 16; compare with claim 3).

In regard to dependent claim 4, Mapedit discloses a method of converting a hotspot

area along with associated URLs to an HTML file format (see Mapedit Figure 16; compare with

claim 4).

In regard to independent claim 5, claim 5 reflects the computer program product

comprising computer readable instructions used for implementing the methods as claimed in

claim 1, and is rejected as such.

In regard to dependent claim 6, Mapedit discloses a method of creating a polygon-

shaped area on a graphics file by creating boundaries via a mouse, said boundaries created until

an enclosed polygon is created (see Mapedit Figure 10; compare with claim 6 line 3).

In addition, Mapedit discloses a method whereby the area within said enclosed polygon

reverses color when subsequently activated via said mouse (see Mapedit Figures 5, 12; compare

with claim 6 line 4).

In regard to dependent claims 7 and 8, claims 7 and 8 reflect the computer program

product comprising computer readable instructions used for implementing the methods as

claimed in claim 3 and 4, and are rejected as such.

In regard to dependent claim 9, Mapedit discloses a method whereby a graphics file

(gif) associated with an HTML file is displayed onto a screen (see Mapedit Figures 2, 3).

Mapedit does not disclose a method of writing out (saving) a composited artwork as an image

file. However, CompuWorks discloses a method whereby a label is created consisting of layered

graphical shapes and text which are composited for a single label (ie. index card), said label is

saved as a label file (see CompuWorks Figure 2; compare with claim 9 line 3). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the method of

CompuWorks to the method of Mapedit, because of CompuWorks's taught advantage of image

saving, providing increased convenience to the imagemap method as taught by Mapedit.

In addition, Mapedit discloses a method of saving an HTML file including an associated

graphics file and a hotspot with associated URLs (see Mapedit Figures 2, 16; compare with

claim 9 lines 4-6).

In regard to dependent claim 10, Mapedit discloses a method whereby a graphics file

associated with an HTML file is displayed onto a screen (see Mapedit Figures 2, 3; compare

with claim 10 lines 2-3, *"receiving from a user of a graphics application operating on the*

electronic artwork "). Mapedit does not disclose a method of accepting user input that selects a

layer of an electronic artwork. However, CompuWorks discloses a method whereby a shape

representing a layer of a composite image is selected, in this example the Java image (see

CompuWorks Figure 2; compare with claim 3 line 3, *"an input that selects the layer"*). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the

method of CompuWorks to the method of Mapedit, because of CompuWorks's taught advantage

of layer selection, providing increased selection convenience to the image display method as

taught by Mapedit.

In regard to dependent claim 11, Mapedit discloses a method whereby areas of a

graphic file are portioned with a specific URL assigned to each portion so as to activate a URL

when an area is selected (see Mapedit Figures 4, 5, 10; compare with claim 11 line 2,

"associating the area and the action"). Mapedit does not disclose a method of associating said

areas with a selected layer as a property of the selected layer. However, CompuWorks discloses a

method of shape selection whereby a shape representing a layer of a composite image is selected

(in this example, a Java image) (see CompuWorks Figure 2; compare with claim 11 lines 2-3,

"with the selected layer as a property of the selected layer "). It would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the method of CompuWorks to the

method of Mapedit, because of CompuWorks's taught advantage of layer selection, providing

increased selection convenience to the imagemap method as taught by Mapedit.

In regard to dependent claim 13, Mapedit discloses a method whereby areas of a

graphic file are portioned with a specific URL assigned to each bounded portion so as to activate

a URL when an area is selected, said area of bounded portion displayed in reverse color when

activated (see Mapedit Figures 4, 5, 10). Mapedit does not disclose a method of calculating any

dynamic content for a selected layer before the area is calculated. However, CompuWorks

discloses a method of shape selection whereby the color of shapes can be modified prior to

saving (see CompuWorks Figure 4 *"Fill Color"*; compare with claim 13 lines 3-4). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the color

selection of CompuWorks to the method of Mapedit, because of CompuWorks's taught

advantage of color editing, providing alternate content criteria presented to the imagemap method

as taught by Mapedit.

In regard to dependent claim 14, Mapedit discloses a method whereby a bounded area

is created and used for displaying reverse video within said area when activated by a mouse (see

Mapedit Figures 4, 5). Mapedit does not disclose a method whereby a combination of one or

more non-transparent regions in a transparent frame define the area of a selected layer. However,

CompuWorks discloses a method whereby a transparent pane contains three non-transparent

regions A, B, C. (see CompuWorks Figure 5; compare with claim 14 lines 2-5). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the multiple

area method of CompuWorks to the bounded area method of Mapedit, because of

CompuWorks's taught advantage of multiple image editing, providing increased functionality to

the method as taught by Mapedit.

In regard to dependent claim 15, claim 15 incorporates substantially significant subject

matter as claimed in claim 14, and in further view of the following, is rejected as such.

CompuWorks discloses a method whereby three non-contiguous non-transparent regions

(A, B, C) are shown in a transparent frame (see CompuWorks Figure 5; compare with claim 15

lines 2-3).

In regard to dependent claim 16, claim 16 incorporates substantially significant subject

matter as claimed in claim 15, and in further view of the following, is rejected as such.

Mapedit discloses a method whereby multiple image maps can be defined in different

areas of an image (see Mapedit Figure 4; compare with claim 16 line 2, *"generating multiple*

image maps").

In regard to dependent claim 17, Mapedit discloses a method whereby a hole is created

subsequent to the creation of three imagemap shapes, said hole can be ignored by selecting delete

from the default URL box so that no action is performed subsequent to the activation of said hole

(see Mapedit Figure 15; compare with claim 17).

In regard to dependent claim 18, Mapedit discloses a method whereby a hole is created

subsequent to the creation of three imagemap shapes, said hole is designated as a hotspot region

by selecting a default URL from the default URL box so that an action is performed subsequent

to the activation of said hole (see Mapedit Figure 15; compare with claim 18 lines 2-3).

In addition, Mapedit discloses a method whereby the imagemaps created during a user

session, including default regions (holes), are collectively used to define an imagemap of a

graphical image (see Mapedit Figure 15; compare with claim 18 lines 4-5).

In regard to dependent claims 19, 20, 22-27, claims 19, 20, 22-27 reflect the computer

program product comprising computer readable instructions used for implementing the methods

as claimed in claims 10, 11, 13-18, and are rejected as such.

4.   Claims 12, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Mapedit and CompuWorks as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Carey et al.

(hereinafter Carey), U.S. Patent No. 5,977,978 issued November 1999.

In regard to dependent claim 12, Mapedit in view of CompuWorks discloses a method

whereby areas of edited graphic file are portioned with a specific URL assigned to each bounded

portion so as to activate a URL when an area is selected, said area of bounded portion displayed

in reverse color when activated (see Mapedit Figures 4, 5, 10). Mapedit does not disclose a

method of conforming the area automatically to content of the selected layer subsequent to

editing of said layer. However, Carey discloses a method of authoring graphic scenes whereby a

3D object is placed within a predetermined drop zone, resulting in said object automatically

scaled to fit within the bounding box dimensions of said drop zone (see Carey column 3 lines

44-50; compare with claim 12 lines 3-4, *"conforming the area automatically to content of the*

selected layer"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to apply the method of Carey to the methods of Mapedit in view of CompuWorks,

because of Carey's taught advantage of scaling, providing increased image placement efficiency

to the the edited imagemap method as taught by Mapedit in view of CompuWorks.

In regard to dependent claim 21, claim 21 reflects the computer program product

comprising computer readable instructions used for implementing the method as claimed in

claim 12, and is rejected as such.

Conclusion

5.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to disclosure.

Stone et al.	U.S. Patent No. 5,818,455	issued	October	1998
Sotiroff et al.	U.S. Patent No. 5,852,810	issued	December	1998
Bier et al.	U.S. Patent No. 5,581,670	issued	December	1996

Art Unit: 2777

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William L. Bashore whose telephone number is **(703) 308-5807**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anton Fetting, can be reached on **(703) 305-8449**. The fax number to this art unit is **(703) 308-6606**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is **(703) 305-3900**.

7.   **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

> Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
> Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

> (703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

or:

> (703) 305-9724 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

W.L.B.
12/10/1999

ANTON W. FETTING
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2700